

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on March 15, 2010 has been reviewed. Claims 1-13 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon (U.S. Patent No. 5,067,173) in view of Smith (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,763).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The entire basis for the rejection of claim 1 of the present application that is set forth in the Office Action is as follows:

With respect to claim 1, 4, 5, 12 and 13 note the Abstract, Col. 3, lines 9 - 60 and Col. 4, lines 10 - 50. Gordon does not explicitly teach providing a power signal to power some components. However, note that Smith discloses such (see at least the Abstract of Smith). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such a power signal as taught by Smith into the Gordon system as such would only entail the substitution of one known power means for another.

Applicant respectfully submits that a proper prima facie showing of obviousness under Section 103 is not set forth in the Office Action. Aside from the claim language “providing a power signal to power at least some components of the access point”, the Office Action failed to explain how the ***actual claim language*** recited in claim 1 is taught or suggested by the proposed combination of Gordon or Smith.

Moreover, claim 1 of the present application recites:

1. An apparatus for communicating wireless local area network (WLAN) signals with an

internetworking device using a transport network, the apparatus comprising:

an access point coupled to the transport network for communicating with an internetworking device, the transport network further providing a power signal to power at least some components of the access point;

the access point further comprising:

i) a wireless local area network (WLAN) access point, for receiving wireless local area network signals from wireless computing equipment and converting such signals to local area network compatible signals; and

ii) an access point remote converter, for receiving the local area network compatible signals from the wireless local area network access point and converting such signals to transport modulated format signals suitable for transmission over the transport network.

Apparently, the Office Action took the position that, aside from “providing a power signal to power at least some components of the access point”, Gordon teaches all the features recited in claim 1 of the present application. However, Gordon does not teach the actual features recited in claim 1 of the present application.

For example, claim 1 recites “a wireless local area network (WLAN) access point, for receiving **wireless local area network signals** from wireless computing equipment and converting such signals to **local area network compatible signals**”. Gordon is *completely silent* as to wireless local area network signals and local area network compatible signals, let alone the particular features recited in claim 1 of the present application, such as “a wireless local area network (WLAN) access point, for receiving wireless local area network signals from wireless computing equipment and converting such signals to local area network compatible signals”.

Claims 2-6 and 8 all depend from claim 1. Therefore, at least the arguments set forth above apply to these dependent claims as well. Since Applicant believes these dependent claims are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1,

specific arguments with respect to these dependent claims have not been provided in this response. Applicant, however, reserves the right to submit further arguments directed to these claims if a further response is required.

The Office Action rejected independent claims 12 and 13 for the exactly the same reasons as claim 1. Therefore, at least the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 apply to the rejection of claims 12 and 13. Applicant, however, does not concede any assertion made in the Office Action with respect to these independent claims and reserves the right to provide additional arguments directed to these independent claims if a further response is required.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-11 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon (U.S. Patent No. 5,067,173) in view of Smith (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,763) further in view of Newson (U.S. Patent No. 5,953,670).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 9-11 all depend from claim 1. Therefore, at least the arguments set forth above apply to these dependent claims as well. Since Applicant believes these dependent claims are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, specific arguments with respect to these dependent claims have not been provided in this response. Applicant, however, reserves the right to submit further arguments directed to these claims if a further response is required.

Serial No.: 10/806,032

Filing Date: 3/22/2004

Attorney Docket No. 100.760US03

Title: ARCHITECTURE FOR SIGNAL DISTRIBUTION IN WIRELESS DATA NETWORK

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-13 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2010-06-15

/Jon M. Powers/
Jon M. Powers
Reg. No. 43,868

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg & Powers LLC
5810 W. 78th Street, Ste. 100
Minneapolis, MN 55439
T – (952) 465-0770
F – (952) 465-0771